

1 Stephen J. Akerley (SBN 160757)  
2 sjakerley@mintz.com  
3 Adrian Kwan (SBN 300032)  
4 akwan@mintz.com  
5 MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY  
6 AND POPEO, P.C.  
7 44 Montgomery Street, 36th Floor  
8 San Francisco, CA 94104  
9 Tel: (415) 432-6000  
10 Fax: (415) 432-6001

11 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
12 Chad Robert Kester

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

IN RE CTF GP PRISONER LITIGATION,

14 Plaintiffs,  
15 v.  
16 DIAZ, et al.;  
17 Defendants.

Case No. 5:19-CV-1974-LHK

**PLAINTIFF CHAD ROBERT  
KESTER'S OPPOSITION TO  
DEFENDANTS' ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION TO CONSIDER  
WHETHER CASES SHOULD BE  
RELATED**

Assigned to:  
The Honorable Lucy H. Koh  
Courtroom 6, 2nd Floor

1 Pursuant to Local Rules 3-12 and 7-11, Plaintiff Chad Robert Kester (“Mr. Kester”) submits  
 2 his Opposition to Defendants R. Diaz, G. Viera Rosa, C. Gipson and C. Koenig’s (collectively,  
 3 “Defendants”) Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related. While  
 4 Defendants do not appear to take a position as to whether Mr. Kester’s pending lawsuit before  
 5 Judge Tigar, *Kester v. Diaz et al.*, Civil Action No. 19-cv-04205-JST (“Kester Action”), should be  
 6 related to the instant action, *In re CTF GP Prisoner Litigation*, Civil Action No. 19-cv-01974-LHK  
 7 (“GP Prisoner Action”), Mr. Kester opposes relation of the cases.

8 Pursuant to Local Rule 3-12(a):

9 **Definition of Related Cases.** An action is related to another when:

10 (1) The actions concern substantially the same parties, property, transaction or event;  
 11 and

12 (2) It appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and  
 13 expense or conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different Judges.

14 Civil Local Rule 3-12(a) (effective May 1, 2018). The Kester and GP Prisoner Actions before the  
 15 Court do not involve the same parties, property, transaction, or event. Nor will litigating the actions  
 16 separately require an unduly burdensome duplication of labor or expense. There is also no  
 17 likelihood that conflicting results will be reached if the cases are conducted before different judges.

18 **I. THE KESTER AND GP PRISONER ACTIONS DO NOT CONCERN THE SAME  
 19 PARTIES, PROPERTY, TRANSACTIONS, OR EVENT**

20 As this Court noted in its order denying *ex parte* relief to the GP Prisoner plaintiffs, the  
 21 Kester and the GP Prisoner Actions do not concern the same parties. Dkt. No. 21 at p. 8. While  
 22 there are common defendants in both the Kester and GP Prisoner Actions, the individual plaintiffs  
 23 are “different, unrelated individuals with [] different alleged circumstances.” *EEOC v. Abercrombie*  
*Fitch Stores, Inc.*, Civil Action No. 10-03911-EJD, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 94353, at \*2 (N.D. Cal.  
 24 Aug. 23, 2011); *see also Allen v. City of Oakland*, Civil Action No. 00-cv-04599-THE (N.D. Cal.  
 25 Nov. 23, 2011) (“[I]mplicit in Civil Local Rule 3-12(a) is the principle that single judges of this  
 26 Court do not become responsible for all cases arising in one area of law, even when some of the  
 27

1 same parties are involved.”). Mr. Kester is a Level II sensitive needs prisoner who is “a convicted  
 2 sex offender, gang drop-out and informant.” Pl.’s First Am. Compl., *Kester v. Diaz et al.*, Civil  
 3 Action No. 4:19-cv-04205-JST, Dkt. No. 37 at ¶ 31 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 3, 2020). By contrast, the GP  
 4 Prisoners have not identified any related characteristics or risk factors. *See, e.g.*, Pl.’s V. First Am.  
 5 Compl., Dkt. No. 17 at p. 2 ll. 3-7.

6 The Kester and GP Prisoner Actions do not concern the same property. While Mr. Kester  
 7 and the GP Prisoner plaintiffs are located at California Training Facility (“CTF”), Mr. Kester and  
 8 the GP Prisoner plaintiffs are located on different yards. Mr. Kester is located on a Level II SNY  
 9 yard and the GP Prisoners are located on either a Level I or Level II GP yard. Defendants have not  
 10 yet stated whether they will convert the Level II GP and/or SNY facilities to NDPFs. *See* Pl.’s First  
 11 Am. Compl., *Kester v. Diaz et al.*, Civil Action No. 4:19-cv-04205-JST, Dkt. No. 37 at ¶ 24 (N.D.  
 12 Cal. Feb. 3, 2020) (“Plaintiff is housed on one of two Level II housing facilities which have not yet  
 13 been converted to NDPF. CDCR expects to convert these remaining two Level II facilities to  
 14 NDPFs in 2020.”); Defs.’ Answer, *Kester v. Diaz et al.*, Civil Action No. 4:19-cv-04205-JST, Dkt.  
 15 No. 46 at p. 2 ll. 20-22 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 24, 2020) (“As to paragraph 24, Defendants lack sufficient  
 16 information or belief to admit or deny the allegation that the Level II housing facilities identified  
 17 in paragraph 24 will be converted to NDPFs in 2020. As to the remaining allegations, Defendants  
 18 admit.”). Defendants have yet to identify the procedures by which they will convert the SNY and  
 19 GP facilities at CTF, or if the GP Prisoner plaintiffs will be transferred to other non-CTF facilities.

20 Finally, the Kester and GP Prisoner Actions do not concern the same transaction or event.  
 21 Because no details of the anticipated integration have been provided, Defendants cannot possibly  
 22 show that these cases involve the same transaction or event. What is certain, however, is that Mr.  
 23 Kester and the GP Prisoner plaintiffs seek different relief. Mr. Kester seeks narrow relief  
 24 precluding Defendants from “housing Plaintiff at any Non-Designated Programming Facility....”  
 25 Pl.’s First Am. Compl., *Kester v. Diaz et al.*, Civil Action No. 4:19-cv-04205-JST, Dkt. No. 37 at  
 26 p. 16 ¶ C (N.D. Cal. Feb. 3, 2020). The GP Prisoner plaintiffs seek broader relief generally

1 enjoining Defendants “from merging the SNY and GP prisoners together in what they refer to as  
 2 Non-Designated Programming Facilities.” Pl.’s V. First Am. Compl., Dkt. No. 17 at p. 7 ll. 6-7.

3 **II. THE KESTER AND GP PRISONER ACTIONS WILL NOT DUPLICATE LABOR  
 4 OR EXPENSES**

5 As discussed above, Mr. Kester and the GP Prisoner plaintiffs share no commonalities with  
 6 respect to their individualized case factors which determine the propriety of their placement in an  
 7 NDPF. Defendants have stated that the decision as to where to house an inmate is determined  
 8 based on each inmate’s individual case factors. Decl. of P. Marziello in Resp. to Aug. 23, 2019  
 9 Order to Show Cause, *Kester v. Diaz et al.*, Civil Action No. 4:19-cv-04205-JST, Dkt. No. 15-1 at  
 10 ¶¶ 2, 7 (describing process for and result of classification review of Mr. Kester’s case factors in  
 11 their totality to determine whether his housing on a SNY was appropriate) (N.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2019).  
 12 Because Defendants’ placement review of each inmate is factually intensive and performed on a  
 13 case-by-case basis, there will be no overlap in labor or expenses. *Nozolino v. Hartford Life &*  
 14 *Accident Ins. Co.*, No. 12-cv-04314-JST, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 80548, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. June 6,  
 15 2013) (“Moreover, the Court is not persuaded that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication  
 16 of labor if the cases are not related, as [plaintiff] admits that ‘[t]he facts of each plaintiff’s disability  
 17 claim will, of course, be unique.’”) (internal citations omitted); *EEOC v. Abercrombie & Fitch  
 18 Stores, Inc.*, No. CV 10-03911 EJD, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 94353, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 23, 2011)  
 19 (declining to relate cases, in part, because “religious accommodation cases are fact-intensive and  
 20 decided on a case by case basis.”).

21 **III. THE KESTER AND GP PRISONER ACTIONS WILL NOT RESULT IN  
 22 CONFLICTING RESULTS**

23 Mr. Kester is asking for very narrow judicial determination that *his* particular case factors  
 24 make *his* placement in a NDPF unconstitutionally dangerous to *him* in violation of *his* Eighth  
 25 Amendment rights. Pl.’s First Am. Compl., *Kester v. Diaz et al.*, Civil Action No. 4:19-cv-04205-  
 26 JST, Dkt. No. 37 at p. 16 ¶ C (N.D. Cal. Feb. 3, 2020). The GP Prisoner plaintiffs admit that they  
 27 are litigating a “novel issue” due to the “mergence (sic) of SNY violent prison gangs [that] has just

1 begun happening.” Dkt. No. 17 at p. 5 ll. 8-9. These issues are distinctly different from one another.  
2 For example, a judgment in favor of Mr. Kester finding his individualized case factors preclude his  
3 placement on a NDPF does not conflict with a dismissal of the GP Prisoner plaintiffs’ claims  
4 finding no threat to GP inmates from being housed with SNY inmates. Nor does a finding that Mr.  
5 Kester is appropriately housed on a NDPF conflict with a finding that the GP Prisoner plaintiffs  
6 face a serious risk of injury from SNY inmates on NDPFs.

7 **IV. CONCLUSION**

8 The similarities identified by Defendants are superficial and insufficient to support a finding  
9 that the case are “related” as defined by Local Rule 3-12.

10  
11 Dated: March 5, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

12  
13 MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND  
POPEO PC

14 By: /s/ Adrian Kwan

15 Stephen J. Akerley (SBN 160757)  
Adrian Kwan (SBN 300032)

16 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
17 Chad Robert Kester

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28